

19
2 APR 8 1930

VOLUME IV.

NUMBER 1

AGRICULTURAL HISTORY

JANUARY

1930

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY THE
AGRICULTURAL HISTORY SOCIETY

THE AGRICULTURAL HISTORY SOCIETY

President

E. MERTON COULTER, University of Georgia

Vice-President

RODNEY H. TRUE, University of Pennsylvania

Secretary-Treasurer

O. C. STINE, United States Department of Agriculture

Executive Committee

(in addition to above-named officers)

Ex-presidents

RODNEY H. TRUE, University of Pennsylvania

LYMAN CARRIER, Coquille, Oregon

O. C. STINE, United States Department of Agriculture

HERBERT A. KELLAR, McCormick Agricultural Library, Chicago

E. E. DALE, University of Oklahoma

SOLON J. BUCK, Minnesota Historical Society

Elected Members

CLARIBEL R. BARNETT, United States Department of Agriculture

ARTHUR P. WHITAKER, Western Reserve University

Editorial Committee:

Editor

O. C. STINE, United States Department of Agriculture

Assistant Editor

EVERETT E. EDWARDS, United States Department of Agriculture

Associate Editors

HERBERT A. KELLAR, McCormick Agricultural Library, Chicago

MARY G. LACY, United States Department of Agriculture

RODNEY H. TRUE, University of Pennsylvania

AGRICULTURAL HISTORY

VOLUME IV

JANUARY, 1930

NUMBER 1

CONTENTS

	Page
FRENCH INFLUENCE ON AMERICAN AGRICULTURE IN THE COLONIAL PERIOD WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO SOUTHERN PROVINCES.....	1
ARTHUR H. HIRSCH	
MATERIALS FOR SOUTHERN AGRICULTURAL HISTORY: MATERIALS FOR VIRGINIA AGRICULTURAL HISTORY.....	10
KATHLEEN BRUCE	
AGRICULTURAL HISTORY MATERIALS AND THEIR COLLECTION.....	14
J. G. DE ROULHAC HAMILTON	
MATERIALS FOR RESEARCH IN THE AGRICULTURAL HISTORY OF THE CONFEDERACY.....	18
CHARLES W. RAMSDELL	
NEWS NOTES AND COMMENTS.....	23

Published Quarterly by
The Agricultural History Society

At Mt. Royal and Guilford Avenues, Baltimore, Maryland.
Editorial Office, Room 301, 1358 B St., S.W., Washington, D. C.

Annual Membership, \$3.00

Life Membership, \$100.00

Entered as second class matter October 12, 1928, at the post office at Baltimore, Md., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

THE AGRICULTURAL HISTORY SOCIETY

THE AGRICULTURAL HISTORY SOCIETY was organized in 1919 to promote interest, study, and research in the history of agriculture. It holds an annual meeting in Washington, D. C., in the spring or early summer. Through an affiliation agreement, it has its principal literary session in connection with the annual meeting of the American Historical Association.

Three volumes of *Agricultural History Society Papers* have been published in coöperation with the American Historical Association as part of its annual reports. These volumes have been distributed separately by the society.

In 1927 the Agricultural History Society began the publication of *Agricultural History*, a quarterly journal which is being developed as a medium for the publication of research and documents pertaining to the history of agriculture and as a clearing house for information of interest and value to workers in the field. The term, agricultural history, is interpreted broadly. Materials on the history of agriculture not only in the United States but in all countries and in all periods of history are included, and also materials on institutions, organizations, and sciences which have been factors in agriculture. Two issues were published in 1927. *Agricultural History* has been issued quarterly since 1928.

Members can help fulfill the purposes of the society by reporting news of research and other activities relating to agricultural history, the location of important documents and papers pertaining to the field, and making suggestions of ways of extending the influence and the scope of the work of the society.

AGRICULTURAL HISTORY

VOLUME IV

JANUARY, 1930

NUMBER 1

FRENCH INFLUENCE ON AMERICAN AGRICULTURE IN THE COLONIAL PERIOD WITH SPECIAL REFER- ENCE TO SOUTHERN PROVINCES¹

BY ARTHUR H. HIRSCH

No one who is familiar with the contents of the Calendar of State Papers and the exhaustive records which they epitomize can fail to appreciate the influence of the French on agriculture in America and the identity of this influence with British political control on this continent. At the opening of the seventeenth century expansion had become an economic necessity to England. She could no longer look to policies, centuries old, to furnish an existence for her people. Across the Channel, France had been for years a furnace of unrest. Fire and sword had strengthened the courage of contenders on all sides to leave everything behind and flee to other lands. French migrations to the British Isles had continued unabated with surprising consistency, and had in some years taken on such proportions as to create new problems of administration in England.² This surplus French population,

¹ Mr. Hirsch has been professor of American history and head of the department of history at Ohio Wesleyan University since 1919. He served as lecturer in American history at Duke University during the summers of 1924, 1926, and 1927, and as professor of American history at the University of Colorado during the summer of 1925. During the current academic year he is visiting professor of American history at the University of Michigan. His publications include *The Huguenots of Colonial South Carolina* (Durham, 1928) and several articles in historical journals. The paper here printed was read at the joint meeting of the Agricultural History Society with the American Historical Association at Durham, N. C., January 1, 1930.

² *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial, 1669-74*, p. 86; *Collections of the South Carolina Historical Society*, II, 90; *MS Colonial Documents of South Carolina*, XVIII, 388.

in the main unemployed, might easily become a public liability.³ And yet, these sturdy newcomers, including vinedressers, gardeners, ordinary laborers, and many skilled in the trades and occupations, though temporarily destitute, were too valuable to shun, too precious to exclude.⁴ From this intolerable situation England sought to extricate herself through a new agricultural policy. She would set up great experiment stations in America. Specialists would be searched for in all lands. Soil and climate would be observed and whatever should prove to be best adapted to them would be produced. England's colonial possessions would furnish her with staples needed for food and raiment. Furthermore, why should England make hazardous journeys to the Baltic lands to procure what she could raise herself; why remain in virtual economic bondage to countries that were her traditional rivals and enemies, when the road to economic independence lay invitingly before her?⁵ Had not writers and mariners for more than a century pointed out that goods for which England was paying handsome tribute to rival countries could be produced at slight cost within her own possessions? Then too, England's political safety required a larger measure of economic independence. Accordingly, England's economic freedom became a slogan, and colonization in America a crusade. The English public was plead with and persuaded. Great sums of money were devoted to it. To this end the French, among whom were many specialists and experts in various branches of agriculture, should be encouraged and used. They had greatly improved the cultivation of the vine and mulberry in such areas as Languedoc, Dauphin and Vaud. Oporto, Bordeaux and Madeira had become opulent by their vines, and Bordeaux the second city of France. The wines of Monserrand and Queries were famous. Why should not French immigrants do the same for America? Renowned French gardeners, such as Combernows, Dumas, and the Moulins,

³ *Collections of the South Carolina Historical Society*, II, 90.

⁴ MS Colonial Documents of South Carolina, I, 65, 71, 78-79, 95; Adam Anderson, *History and Chronological Deduction of the Origin of Commerce* (London, 1801), I, 31; Preamble 7 Anne c.5.

⁵ Richard Hakluyt, *Discourse on Western Planting*, 31; Samuel Smiles, *The Huguenots* (New York, 1868), 250.

had settled in the fertile areas of Cour and Lausanne, had taught the superior modes of agriculture to the peasants, while Brutilde la Riviere, of Montpellier, had done likewise concerning the mulberry. Should not the vinedressers and gardeners of Saintonage, Poitou and La Rochelle, reproduce their vineyards and groves in America? Thus encouraged the labor and enterprise of Frenchmen played no small part in the development of agriculture in this country.⁶ French families spread themselves over the American tidewater districts. A rich soil, bestowed in generous and multiplied grants, was fundamental. Enterprise and skill, supplementing these, yielded permanent returns. The uncultivated banks of the James River were transformed. All Virginia admired the flourishing state of their model farms in the vicinity of Manakin Town. In Carolina and Georgia they reared beautiful plantations on the banks of the Cooper, the Santee, and the Savannah.⁷ Such travelers as Thomas Ashe, Lawson, and others, commented with no little surprise on the display of industry and thrift of the French. Lawson beheld, as he says, a country but recently covered with swamps, now rapidly assuming the appearance of the best cultivated parts of France.⁸ There are records of the sale of no less than 33,000 acres of land to French immigrants in South Carolina alone prior to 1698, besides all the free grants. Other provinces and colonies show similar figures. Gift-grants run as high as 5,000, 8,000, and even 12,000 to 15,000 acres to Frenchmen skilled in agricultural pursuits.⁹

In the provinces to the South for generations the French directed their efforts more particularly toward the cultivation of the vine, the silk-worm and mulberry, and the olive, whereas,

⁶ *Collections of the South Carolina Historical Society*, II, 90; *Calendar of State Papers*, Colonial, 1669-74, p. 86; Charles Weiss, *History of the French Protestant Refugees* (Edinburgh and London, 1854), 503 f.

⁷ Arthur H. Hirsch, *The Huguenots of Colonial South Carolina* (Durham, N. C., 1928), ch. 2.

⁸ John Lawson, *Journal* (London, 1714), 7-15.

⁹ Alex H. Salley, jr., *Narratives of Early Carolina* (New York, 1912); MS Land Warrants, South Carolina 1672-92, 1692-1711, 2 volumes at Office of the Historical Commission, Columbia, S. C.; MS Land Plat Books and Memorial Books (Office of the Historical Commision, Columbia, S. C.).

before the American Revolution rice, indigo and cotton claimed increasingly their attention. Each in turn was made the object of English bounty, while each in turn suffered the customary reverses, when affected by changing economic conditions.

From their earliest residence in America the French displayed an interest in the grape. The vine grew wild in the Southern provinces, but its artificial culture was introduced there by the French, and generous bounties were often bestowed for their industry in this branch of agriculture. The transplanting and acclimatation of native French grape-vines was the leading occupation of such men as Lewis Gervais and Lewis St. Pierre. Gervais, after six years of industry is reported to have cultivated a vine that needed no supports.¹⁰ According to De Brahm, it was wound on the ground and piled up in such a way as to form a close bower, or as the French called it a "chapele," whereunder it shaded its own ground and thus retained its moisture. De Brahm, who was British Surveyor for the Southern District of America, hailed this as one of the most important acquisitions of the past sixty years in this branch of development.¹¹ Meanwhile St. Pierre was also at work. He returned to France again and again to obtain the best plants that the market afforded and to hire gardeners for his grape farms on the Savannah River, whereas, in the Hillsboro Township in the up-country, he hoped to build the most extensive vineyard in America.¹² In vision he saw the day when every planter would have at least a half-acre in grapes. In one consignment he brought over 160,000 plants from French nurseries. Then, with the Earl of Hillsborough behind him, he organized a joint-stock company, capitalized at £40,000 in which he ventured all his American holdings. This man, as the Council Journals reveal, was a promoter of no mean proportions.¹³ His

¹⁰ MS Colonial Documents of South Carolina, I, 238. (Office of the Historical Commission, Columbia, S. C.).

¹¹ P. C. J. Weston, ed., *Documents Connected with the History of South Carolina* (London, 1856), 167.

¹² MS copy of St. Pierre's plan, written in 1771 (Library of Congress); MS Colonial Documents of South Carolina, XXX, 101 f.

¹³ MS Council Journals, 1765-66, p. 568-569; MS Colonial Documents of South Carolina, XXXIII, 91-122; MS Council Journal, 1768, p. 101 (Office of the Historical Commission, Columbia, S. C.).

enterprise received such rewards as a gold medal, bestowed by the London Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Agriculture and Commerce.

With such energy in the background, the future importance of the American grape industry in the eyes of England and France may be surmised from the following incident: Monsieur Pierre Legaux had set up a vineyard on the outskirts of Philadelphia, a sort of nursery project on four acres of land devoted to 300 plants, which he had brought from Burgundy, Champaigne and Bordeaux. The 300 plants in ten years increased to 100,000. From a single vine obtained in Constantia he produced 3000 plants. His success there inspired a similar project in the area that is now Kentucky; in each case, only poor, rugged soil, unadapted to raising grain was employed. Such travelers as the Abbe Raynal, Jean Brissot, and the Marquis de Chastellux had observed his work with interest and fear. Raynal, writing before the American Revolution protested that the industrial life of France was being threatened by vineyards set up in America by natives of France, and demanded that the wine business should be left to France alone. Alarmed by such accounts as this, the French government intervened in behalf of what she held to be her monopoly on grape culture. Orders were sent in secret to the French Ambassador, then residing in Philadelphia, to take necessary steps. Legaux, who years before had forfeited both citizenship and property by his flight from France, was offered a restoration of both, travel expenses to return to France, and a cash gift of the equivalent of \$3,500 if he would uproot his vineyard and return to France. Furthermore, Lord Hillsborough, the British Minister to the American Department, who had graciously aided Legaux and Pierre, was induced for a consideration of £250,000 to withdraw his support from the American wine industries. Except for such powerful intervention America might easily have become one of the greatest wine marts of the world and France's most daring rival.¹⁴ That Legaux turned his unheed-

¹⁴ Broadsides (Gilpin Collection), VI, no. 799 and 821 (Pennsylvania Historical Society, Philadelphia); "Memorial on the Practicability of Growing Vineyards in South Carolina (1798)," *Pennsylvania Historical Society Pamphlets*, I; Map Of. 6976, (Pennsylvania Historical Society, Philadelphia); Jean Pierre Brissot, *Travels in America*, ch. 19.

ing ear away from these alluring offers is indicated in the fact that as late as 1801 he was still head of a vineyard joint-stock company in Philadelphia with his four-acre vine nursery still a nucleus. His scheme there was not unlike many of the fox-farm schemes of our own day. You buy a fox for ten dollars and get its increase for ten years. In Legaux's case vines were paid as dividends to stockholders and they received vines in proportion to the amount of money they paid in. His vines raised on these four acres furnished millions of plants which as they were grown were transplanted in all the surrounding territory, not only in Pennsylvania, but far to the south and north.¹⁵

The history of the attempts of the French to establish silk farms is not a story of wasted time and effort. England had long envied France her practical monopoly in silk production. Until the eve of the American Revolution the efforts of the French in America were constant, though not infrequently relapsing into only a casual interest. The ship *Richmond* (1680) was only one of a number of vessels subsidized by the English government and sent to America loaded with French families and cargoes of silk worms. In this particular case the length of the voyage was not correctly estimated. The eggs hatched at sea and the worms died for want of proper food. But later cargoes served just as well. The mulberry grew wild along the Atlantic coast, but the French planted numerous mulberry groves.¹⁶ Specialists were sent to France repeatedly to confer with French experts. Repeated tests and experiments were made in silk production, bearing results that rivaled the best French products. Benjamin Godin, by 1710, was shipping bales of drawn silk to England annually, and the Beresford firm, in London, was happy to handle all that he could transport. In 1712 an English bounty was passed and was designed to encourage the cultivation of silk in America. Such French names as Gibert, Godin, Mazýck, Poyas, Manigault, and

¹⁵ Broadsides, VI, no. 799 and 821 (Pennsylvania Historical Society, Philadelphia).

¹⁶ MS Assembly Journal, South Carolina, 1765-8, MS Colonial Documents, South Carolina, V, 152, XVII, 178-180, and XXIV, 158 (Office of the Historical Commission, Columbia, S. C.); B. R. Carroll, *Historical Collections of South Carolina* (Charleston, 1845).

others appear constantly on the shippers books and in the advertisements of the newspapers. Complete silk enterprises were set up, including farm, school and factory. Apprentices were taught the entire process of silk production. Prizes were offered by the English government and by learned societies to those who would raise the largest number of mulberry trees. By 1758 Georgia was shipping thousands of pounds of drawn silk to England annually. Savannah, one of the leading export centers was alone receiving 10,000 pounds a year for export.¹⁷ Silk reached its highest development in the Hillsboro settlement of French farmers. Here its chief promoter was Jean Lewis Gibert, and its chief patron Gabriel Manigault, whose plantation in the tidewater was named "Silk Hope." It was largely because of the success of silk in the Hillsboro section that a factory for spinning silk was opened in Charles Town in 1766 and in Hillsboro the same year. Then Gibert sent to France for three experts to assist him in producing and winding silk. In 1768 a filature was erected at Purrysburg, near Savannah. This, like other enterprises was financed by the provincial government. By 1770, though the enterprise was on the decline, thousands of pounds of drawn silk were being shipped from Charles Town and Savannah regularly.¹⁸ By a balanced mixture of silk and wool in rugs, shawls and other garments, the French of this area attracted attention in foreign lands. Their cloth factory in Charles Town and its product were well enough known to receive mention in such literature as George Dumont's *History of Commerce*, published in 1755.¹⁹

Silk was never a profitable product in this country and consequently needed artificial stimulation again and again to keep it

¹⁷ *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic*, 1598-1601, p. 500; *Domestic Papers*, James I, Jan. 5, 1607; Carroll, *op. cit.*, II, 118; *South Carolina Gazette*, Dec. 11, 1736, May 12, 1733, and Sept. 19, 1755; MS Colonial Documents of South Carolina, XVII, 178; Anderson, *op. cit.*, III, 130; MS Assembly Journal of South Carolina, 1737-41, p. 94; 1733-8, p. 281 and 287.

¹⁸ *South Carolina Gazette*, Feb. 15, 1739, Apr. 1, 1745, Nov. 27, 1749, Nov. 13, 1752, Aug. 3, 1765, May 11, 1767; *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine*, XII, 112; Anderson, *op. cit.*, III, 309; MS Assembly Journal of South Carolina, 1731-47, p. 59, 94, 99, and 105; MS Assembly Journal, 1765-8, p. 177; 1769-71, p. 12.

¹⁹ Georges Marie Butel Dumont, *Histoire et Commerce des Colonies Anglaises dans L'Amérique Septentrionale* (Nouvelle ed., A la Haye, 1755), 292-293.

above the plane of mere novelty. More profitable employments in indigo, rice and cotton were prone to lure the French to other fields of activity. Rice was a profitable staple and was in great demand in Europe and America. It yielded as high as fifty bushels to the acre even in the early years. By 1748, despite the rivalry of indigo, rice lands were doubling in value every three or four years. But the work was heavy and expensive. Slaves had to stand knee and loin deep in a stooped position in stagnant water to remove the weeds from rice fields. This part of the rice culture was revolutionized by a Frenchman, Gideon Dupont, of Goose Creek.²⁰ He pointed out that by flooding the fields at stated seasons the grass and weeds were killed, while at the same time the rice thrived thereby. Owing to the practicability of this device it sprang into general use in the South.²¹

The French were also influential in the development of inventions for the *threshing* of rice. By the old method the straw was winnowed by the use of flail and fork, and the adhesive husk of rice kernels, difficult to remove, was separated by use of a mortar and pestle—the mortar as a rule a hollow stump, the pestle a wooden club. This was revolutionized by the use of the Guerrard machine. Guerrard's patent served as the mechanical basis for later improvements and inventions, more notably those of Peter Villepontoux, Francis Gracia, and George Veitch. These machines were in use all over the South where rice was raised.²²

There is time to but mention the contributions of one or two Frenchmen in the development of indigo. Ramsay attributes the introduction of indigo from Barbadoes to the continent, to Eliza Lucas, the mother of Major General Charles C. Pinckney, of South Carolina. If Eliza Lucas gave the first impulse to its

²⁰ MS Assembly Journal of South Carolina, 1769-71, p. 12; MS Probate Court Record, 1752-56, p. 282, refers to Daniel Huger's "Rice Hope." (Office of the Historical Commission, Columbia, S. C.).

²¹ South Carolina *Gazette*, July 21, 1733; David Ramsay, *History of South Carolina* (Charleston, 1808), II, 207; Alex H. Salley, jr., *op. cit.*, 69; Anderson, *op. cit.*, III, 15; MS Colonial Documents of South Carolina, XX, 338; XXXIII, 211 f; Thomas Cooper and D. J. McCord, *Statues at Large of South Carolina* (Columbia, 1836-1841), II, 63.

²² *Ibid.*; MS Colonial Documents of South Carolina, 1728-33, p. 1043; XXXII, 33; MS Council Journal, 1730-4, p. 246; MS Assembly Journal, 1728-33, p. 888; South Carolina *Gazette*, July 21, 1733, May 18, 1734, Aug. 21, 1736.

general introduction, Andrew Deveaux, a Frenchman, supplied the original skill and industry. Miss Lucas observing that the indigo plant grew wild in Carolina, and having raised some of it on her father's plantation, sent to Montserrat for a man conversant with the complete process. This man, Cromwell by name, repenting of his bargain to go to Carolina and thereby injure his own enterprise in the West Indies, deceived his mistress by using too much lime in his experiments. Andrew Deveaux was thereupon employed. He discovered Cromwell's duplicity by virtue of his own experience with indigo in France. Deveaux became the provincial expert and through his efforts a quality of indigo was produced in America that rivaled the best French product.²³ By 1774 the American export of indigo had reached above a million pounds annually. The French were natural leaders, and such families at the St. Juliens, Perroneaus, Marions, Legares, and Ravenels accumulated solid fortunes in its cultivation.²⁴

Thomas Mellichamp, of French-Swiss parentage, meanwhile revolutionized the culture of indigo, by his new method of growth and extraction of the dye, for the discovery of which the provincial assembly of South Carolina made him a gift of £1,000.²⁵ Through such efforts the popularity of indigo was drawing the attention away from rice and other cereals. The back-country was rapidly introducing indigo. Henry Laurens and John Lewis Gervais were developing an indigo farm of 13,200 acres near Ninety Six, and were planning to lay out several hundred thousand acres in indigo fields, when the introduction of chemical dyes in Europe called a halt and indigo soon passed from view.²⁶ Cotton, from that time forward was destined to receive much of the attention that had formerly been devoted to other activities. A discussion of this important industry and the influence of the French on other branches of agriculture must be reserved for another time and place.

²³ Ramsay, *op. cit.*, II, 209-210; E. Holbrook, *Journal and Letters of Eliza Lucas* (Wormsloe, 1850); Cooper, *op. cit.*, II, 78; Abiel Holmes, *American Annals, 1669-1775* (Cambridge, 1805), II, 167, 204; *South Carolina Gazette*, Dec. 2, 1745; Weston, *op. cit.*, 88; MS Colonial Documents of South Carolina, XXXIV, 204.

²⁴ *South Carolina Gazette*, Apr. 1, 1745, Feb. 7, 1746, Dec. 16, 1756, Dec. 24, 1772.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, Aug. 23, 1760.

²⁶ D. D. Wallace, in *The South in the Building of the Nation* (New York, 1902), V, 181.

MATERIALS FOR SOUTHERN AGRICULTURAL HISTORY¹

MATERIALS FOR VIRGINIA AGRICULTURAL HISTORY

BY KATHLEEN BRUCE

Probably almost everyone who has fallen under the spell of research has at some time tried to puzzle out the reason for its fascination, and possibly more than one person has reached the conclusion that a passion for research is a variant of the sporting instinct of man—what the President of our Association would call “an historical survival.” I am never more certain of this belief than when I am with a friend of mine, a substantial part of whose time is given to trailing and collecting Virginia documents. His generosity in helping a fellow researcher is notable, but what gives special joy and inspiration is his particular mode of imparting his information. Like a boy who has just found a rare bird’s nest, he will say with shining eyes, “I know where some good stuff is!” And with a thrill one’s mind travels back to the youth of the race. Because I knew where a certain bird’s nest full of eggs was lodged—in other words a plantation house in which records have been accumulating for nearly a hundred years, I was seized with the desire to study Virginian agriculture in the period before 1865.

On the programme of this luncheon I am slated to speak on materials for the agricultural history of Virginia, but I was told that if I pleased I might discuss the nature of the manuscripts which I am upturning. This I shall try to do, and I delay that discussion only to say that the backbone of any agricultural study

¹ The three discussions here printed under the general heading Materials For Southern Agricultural History were presented at the luncheon tendered by the University of North Carolina to members of the Agricultural History Society and guests at Chapel Hill, North Carolina, December 31, 1929.

of Virginia in the first half of the nineteenth century lies in the seven thousand pages more or less of the *Farmer's Register* and in the *Southern Planter*, which began to be published the year before the cessation of the *Register*, and the early volumes of John Skinner's periodical, *The American Farmer*. Though Edmund Ruffin did not initiate the *Register* until 1833, his material frequently reaches back to the beginning of the agricultural revolution in Virginia around 1808-1810, and occasionally to the preliminaries of the movement in the eighteenth century. To the Bruce Papers in Berry Hill Plantation House I shall now confine my brief paper.

In the graveyard a few feet distant from the great Greek structure lie the bones of the chief actors in the manuscripts. One of them built the house. And though electricity directed by three or four servants now executes the work anciently performed in it by a multitude of black hands, the spirit of that civilization in Virginia, wiped out in 1861-1865, lives in its classic beauty, its combined simplicity and grandeur, and in certain old humane customs of a more lavish if a simpler day. When the elemental forces of birth or death rock the foundations of a plantation family, or fire or river-freshet destroy in a twinkling the fruit of months of toil, the injured folk, like the slaves of former days, as a matter of course turn to the Big House for sympathy and for material aid.

The manuscripts embrace four generations. Those which relate to agriculture before 1865 reach back to 1786, but extend in volume from 1802 to 1865. They are a huge mass of the business and personal papers of a remarkable father and son. Because Virginia has been scientifically studied to but small extent, we have some false ideas of what existed there. One of them is that the planters confined themselves to agriculture and politics. On digging into seventeenth and eighteenth century records, one discovers agriculture often but a single department of the activity of those busy men. Thus a Cary, a Cabell, a Jerdone, a Spotswood, or a Washington might be engaged also as a contractor erecting public buildings at Williamsburg, as agent for a British mercantile house, or as partner, dominant or otherwise, in flour mills, iron works, or iron mines.

In 1779, James Bruce, a youth of sixteen, who as eldest son was heir to a considerable estate in Orange County, Virginia, left the home of his planter father, and went into the counting house of the Colquhouns in Petersburg, Virginia. In twenty years this youth had become the pioneer financier of Southside Virginia —that region in the state which lies south of James River and west of the fall line. And this position he held until his death in 1837. Between 1802 and 1837 he was the dominant partner in nine country stores, in several flour mills, in a manufactory of plaster for fertilizer, in a commercial blacksmith's shop, and the owner of at least six plantations containing thousands of acres in Halifax, Charlotte, and Mecklenburg counties. In the ledgers, journals, deeds, business correspondence, and estate books of James Bruce, the general agricultural situation for thirty-five years is revealed in the counties of Charlotte, Halifax, Mecklenburg, Lunenburg, Pittsylvania, and Franklin. "But why," it may well be asked, "should a merchant's records constitute a source for agricultural history?" (1) Because his stores were set at strategic points in an agricultural population whose currency was largely tobacco; (2) because he himself was a planter of wheat and tobacco, carrying on through agents progressive farming; (3) because he was a miller with mills in Halifax and Charlotte counties, grinding from his own and other plantations wheat which he shipped to Norfolk and sold in a world market; (4) because he was manufacturer of fertilizer; (5) because he was a leader in a movement to develop an inland waterway system as an outlet for his agricultural section, by canalizing the Roanoke River and its tributaries, the Bannister, the Staunton, and the Dan; and (6) because he carried on a private banking business, making loans at six per cent and preferably for not less than two years to a farming population or to commercial houses which were likely to prosper or suffer pecuniarily as the farming population prospered or suffered.

While the papers of James Bruce reveal the general agricultural situation of a large slice of southside Virginia, those of his son James C. Bruce give a detailed picture of the economic and social life of a great Virginian planter and his family in the thirty-five years immediately preceding the fall of the slavoeracy. Like the

father the son was a keen business man and from time to time financed his section by loans at the legal rate of interest. But the father was primarily the financier. In a limited agricultural area of Virginia, by business acumen, industry, great patience, and integrity, James Bruce built a fortune which is said to have ranked in the United States when he died next to those of his contemporaries, John Jacob Astor and Stephen Gerard. In a public speech his friend and neighbor, John Randolph of Roanoke, once cited the Virginian as comparable with the two Northern merchants. Living in a period without our mechanical conveniences of typewriter, telegraph, telephone, radio, steam railway, and automobile, his business carried on by hand and on horseback, by wagon train, and by batteau, made his life hardly less of a continuous drive than that of the big business man of today. He was an eager agriculturist, but necessarily an agriculturist by proxy. On the other hand, the son, left executor of an estate which under his management increased from about two millions in 1837 to about four millions in 1860, was also a business man. But James C. Bruce's passion was planting and literature. His papers include an unbroken file of his letter books, plantation accounts to the most petty receipt of a few cents paid to or by himself, and a voluminous family correspondence. A leader in his county in progressive planting and in thought, his genius for literary expression impelled him often to write—as he might have expressed it—on patriotism and turnips. Educated on this spot—Chapel Hill—at Harvard College, and at the University of Virginia, he was a Whig in politics and was sent by the Unionists in his county to voice them in the Secession Convention of Virginia. This notable agriculturist photographs also the social and political aspects of his time so that in studying him one must get a comprehensive picture of a member—possibly of a whole family connection—of the class which ruled Virginia before 1860.

In closing let me say that my personal experience reveals to me that the Bruce Papers are but one of many collections of manuscripts ripe for exploitation in Virginia. Let me also add that I believe that those papers, seemingly inaccessible, are in reality available to a certain type of person. He need not be a Virginian

but one who by means of the *Farmer's Register* and other records knows what families inhabited certain districts; who can ferret out their descendants in collateral as well as direct line today; and who can establish some direct social connection, either of the bloodkin or family friendship, so that a feeling of trust is at once established.

Though we are living in an internationally minded era, the researcher in Virginia though studying but a single phase of her history will not find it "too narrow" for his mind. He may at first feel "bound in a nutshell." But let him once lose himself in the printed records of Virginia and in a conglomerate mass of private papers of intellects in native ability comparable with those in any era or country, and like Hamlet he will count himself "king of infinite space"—with, of course, the qualification of Hamlet: that he does not have bad dreams—over those papers!

AGRICULTURAL HISTORICAL MATERIALS AND THEIR COLLECTION

BY J. G. DE ROULHAC HAMILTON

I take it that the makers of the program, in asking me to discuss the subject of Agricultural History Material and its Collection intended that I should give to this group whatever benefit you may derive from my experience in the collection of such material as a part of the Southern Historical Collection at the University of North Carolina.² In any event, that is what I am going to talk to you about, as it is the only phase of the assigned subject that I feel at all competent to treat.

Unique as the South has always been in its agricultural system, we know all too little about it. In spite of certain able, scholarly, and valuable discussions, too familiar to require mention here, what do we know of the realities of slavery? How much do we know of agricultural operations and methods other than as they relate to the staple crops, and do we know all that there is to know about those staples? The unsatisfactory answer that must be

² See also Professor Hamilton's article entitled "A National Southern Collection at the University of North Carolina," in the Baltimore *Sun*, March 4, 1928.

given to these questions is identical with what would have to be given to other inquiries concerning the South's dominating industry.

The lack of knowledge alluded to is due to a number of causes. Frequently on Southern plantations, particularly on the smaller ones everywhere, and even on the larger ones of the upper South, no systematic records were ever kept. Where the records were actually kept they were often of the haphazard, hit-or-miss sort. And, not of least importance, the lack of interest, even among historical students, until very recently, in the sort of material out of which our agricultural past must be re-created, has allowed much of the material to be destroyed in one way or another.

In the work of locating and collecting Southern historical material I have been particularly interested in the preservation of sources of social and economic character. I have, therefore, been particularly eager with respect to those bearing upon agriculture. And out of my experience I have made a sort of classification of material relating to the subject.

There is, in the first place, a considerable body of printed matter of varying importance and interest. First may be mentioned books, not in great number it is true, but valuable for the light they throw on conditions existent when they were written. More important, perhaps, is the material scattered through newspapers, vast in amount and bearing directly or indirectly upon agriculture. At best they are rather disappointing, and I find myself constantly irritated by the shocking failure of newspaper editors of an earlier day to foresee what this generation of historical investigators would require of them, and at their lack of foreknowledge of what we would regard as important, and at their consequent foolish waste of valuable space with—to us—hopelessly uninteresting matter. And, most important of all, are the very numerous, though usually short-lived agricultural journals, some national, others of a distinctly sectional appeal, and still others which were intended primarily for the readers of a single state. Some of them were conducted very ably; others were poorly managed, but all of them throw light on many phases of agriculture.

The most valuable material for agricultural history is in manuscript form, and there are three main classes of it still existent in considerable quantity. The first deals directly and primarily with agriculture; the other two, while treating it only incidentally, are in many respects more valuable than the first. These three are plantation records proper, business records, and private letters. A fourth type of manuscript source, so rarely found that I have not included it in the classification, consists of personal diaries of people engaged in agriculture. Where these are found their importance cannot be over-stated.

Plantation records appear in many forms. The most common, perhaps, are the various types of slave records. These are frequently mere lists of the negroes owned by a family. Often they are recorded in the family Bible and where this is the case it usually indicates a quite patriarchal form of the peculiar institution. More often they are lists of those owned at a given time, as, for example, when entered for taxes. I may add parenthetically, that when prepared for such an occasion they tend to encourage the belief that chronic ill-health was the common lot of the slave, since in most states the hopelessly disabled were exempt from taxation. On the other hand, if prepared at other times, say when a sale was impending, they convey a very different impression. Again we may find volumes containing an elaborate record of each negro through life or through the period of ownership, with considerable wealth of detail. Dates of birth and death frequently appear with such facts as the number and names of children, health and disease, particular occupations, values and, when sold, prices. These things have high importance in agricultural history, of course, but they are even of greater significance in general social and economic investigations.

Some plantations kept more or less complete crop records. Usually these are fragmentary, but they are very valuable. Much rarer, but occasionally found, are records of the land with details of fertilizing and cultivation, with crop yields. Weather conditions are often recorded and also the appearance of various pests. Overseer's or owner's plantation diaries are found now and then and are always most informing. Existential occasionally, too,

are sales records and, very rarely, a record of purchases for the plantation.

The second group of records which aid agricultural history research are the papers of business firms of one sort or another. Correspondence, unfortunately, has not often survived, but the ledgers reveal much about one side of agriculture.

And finally, with the added value of their human quality, their contemporary interpretation from day to day and year to year, are the collections of family letters. I need not call to your attention in detail the reasons for the dogmatic statement I am going to make that they furnish more important and detailed information as to agriculture, its methods, practices, problems, and conditions, than all the rest combined. They touch the subject from every angle. The tragedy is that in so many cases there has been no recognition of their value as an historical source, and that they have so frequently been destroyed or allowed to perish.

The glaring and distressing deficiency in the records of agriculture in the Old South is the absence of material bearing upon the work and life of the small farmer. Few, if any, kept records; at least practically none can be found. The story of farming in the Old South tends always to become a tale of the plantation. It can hardly be otherwise. Yet considering what a large proportion of the agricultural population was included in the group of small slaveholders and non-slaveholders, this is a great misfortune.

There remains one class of historical material that has thus far never received, at least in the South, the attention it deserves. No attempt has been made on a large scale to collect for study the implements of agriculture, all the impedimenta of the farm. We shall be increasingly aware of their value as time passes as historical sources, and the rather remarkable work that Mr. Henry Ford is doing in the preservation of the things people have worked with and lived with in America might with profit be imitated in particular sections.

My own experience in gathering the sort of material I have mentioned has been entirely in connection with the Southern Collection at the University of North Carolina where we are undertaking to gather for preservation and for the use of investigators

every sort of printed and manuscript material that throws light upon the past of the old slave states. The location of such material is not an entirely easy task, but once located the average owner welcomes the opportunity to place the records where they will be properly cared for and where they will play a worthwhile part in making clear the story of the South's past. And I find that people everywhere are far more historically-minded than they were when I began this work some twenty years ago.

MATERIALS FOR RESEARCH IN THE AGRICULTURAL HISTORY OF THE CONFEDERACY

BY CHARLES W. RAMSDELL

In considering the agricultural history of the Confederacy there are two things to be kept in mind: *first*, agricultural methods, processes and routine; *second*, the special conditions and problems imposed by the war. Methods and processes of planting, cultivation and harvesting differed in no essential way from those in use before secession. For instance, though labor became very scarce, there was no shift to wider use of labor-saving machinery, such as occurred in the Northwest, because the new machinery could not be had. Therefore, the student of agriculture under the Confederacy must first make himself familiar with the agricultural methods in use in the South before 1861.

The chief interest in Confederate agricultural history, it seems to me, lies in the second division of the subject—in the new conditions and problems imposed by the war itself. Here we find radical and startling changes from the pre-war conditions. By way of clarifying and justifying this statement, perhaps it would be best to mention some of the more important effects of the war upon the agricultural population. The time allotted to this paper will not permit me to name them all.

The constant drain of men into the armies left large sections of the country—the small farmer sections, primarily—almost bare of agricultural labor. The result was a marked decline in production. The interior plantation belt, though more stable, was affected by the withdrawal of owners into the service of the

government, by the repeal of the law exempting overseers, and by the frequent calls for negroes to work on fortifications or at other tasks. Along the coast, Union forces landed and occupied or raided plantations from Virginia to Florida, carrying off thousands of slaves, driving thousands of others with their owners into the interior, and demoralizing large sections even beyond their military lines. As the Federal armies worked southward from Kentucky and Missouri, overrunning middle and western Tennessee, Arkansas, and the greater portions of Mississippi and Louisiana, thousands of farms and plantations in those areas were abandoned and a heavier burden thrown upon those still within the Confederate lines. With respect to crops, the most marked change was the reduction of the staples: cotton, tobacco, and sugar. Cotton was withheld from the market at first as a diplomatic and economic threat; afterwards its production was checked by the blockade and the vital necessity of producing food-stuffs. There was a rapid shift to corn, wheat (where possible), peas, potatoes, hay, and the like. James H. Hammond's cotton crop in 1861 was 442 bales; in 1863 it was 700 pounds, or about one and a half bales. Markets had shifted; railway transportation proved inadequate to move both crops and government business, and soon all but broke down completely. River navigation almost ceased. The demands of the armies for horses and mules drained the country of surplus work-teams, and then many of those actually necessary on the farms and plantations were impressed. The same was true of wagons. Work oxen were taken by the commissary officers for beef to feed the soldiers. The extreme scarcity of that universal necessity, salt, made it difficult at all times, and impossible in many cases, to preserve and cure meats. A heavy frost in the middle of September, 1863, killed the unripe corn in the upper piedmont and mountain country, where there would have been little enough anyway, and brought the fear of starvation to that whole region. Everywhere farm implements were wearing out, and so scarce was iron they could seldom be replaced or repaired. By the end of 1863 the Confederate currency had collapsed; everyone, even the government itself, was forced to the slow and cumbrous system of barter. Then because the govern-

ment had neither money nor credit it levied a tithe-tax upon agricultural produce and impressed supplies at prices below the market rate. Perhaps it is unnecessary to mention the inevitable destruction of fences, crops and live-stock in the active war zones, or the wholesale and deliberate devastations by such Federal generals as Averill, Hunter, Sheridan, Sherman and Wilson. This list is already too long, and some of you may question whether all of these items pertain to agricultural history. I confess to great difficulty in determining where the line delimiting agricultural history should be drawn—if, indeed, there *is* such a line at all.

But if these things are part of the agricultural history of the Confederacy, it is both easy and difficult to indicate the source materials for the study of that subject—easy, because they permeate all the records of the Confederate people, who were mostly agriculturists, and difficult because they are so diffused and intermingled with other materials that their discovery requires long and patient searching.

Of the printed materials, the newspapers, with all their faults, are the most important. From the beginning, the Confederate newspapers gave most of their space to the news of the war and but little directly to agriculture; but the student who gleans them will find considerable incidental information. They argued zealously for the reduction of cotton and tobacco acreage and for larger food crops; they noted the condition of crops, price fluctuations, the transportation shortage; they commented frequently upon the growing practice of impressment and the increasing reluctance of farmers to exchange their produce for currency. By 1863 most of them had either stopped publication or were reduced to one small sheet with little room for news of any sort. Outside the larger towns, few lasted through the war; and of these not many complete files have been preserved. They are to be found, however, in the archives of the southern state historical commissions and of historical societies, in some of the southern college and university libraries, and in a number of the great northern libraries. The largest collection is in the Library of Congress. Southern agricultural journals for the war period are

extremely scarce. I know of but one, the *Southern Cultivator*, published at Augusta, Georgia, which continued through the war; and the only file of its war numbers that I have located is in the Library of the University of Georgia. *DeBow's Review*, which was not, of course, devoted exclusively to agriculture, removed from New Orleans to Charleston, and later to Columbia, South Carolina. It issued only a few numbers after 1862 and these are now rare. I do not recall any other agricultural journals that carried on far into the war period, but doubtless a few exist and may be found.

Very few of the printed books contain anything that is satisfactory for this subject. That enormous and unwieldy collection of documents familiarly known as the *Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies* contains, in Series IV, a considerable amount of economic material on the Confederacy, some of which, directly and indirectly, pertains to agricultural conditions. Very few of the published diaries and memoirs describe conditions on the farms, though they give much attention to the subjects of food, medicines and clothing—perhaps because so many of them were written by women. Few collections of family papers belonging to the war period have been published. Letters from people at home to their men in the army would be very useful, but not many have been printed. Probably few of them were saved. It is worth remembering that the letters and diaries of northern soldiers often described conditions in the country in which they operated; and they have been published much more copiously than those of the Confederates.

The investigator must search through widely scattered manuscripts for material on Confederate agriculture. Perhaps the greatest single group of manuscripts is the so-called "Confederate Archives" in the Old Records Division of the Adjutant General's Office in Washington. Though supposed to consist primarily of the military papers of the Confederacy, they contain a very considerable amount of non-military material; but because of the peculiar organization of the Archives, one has to search long and patiently and exercise some ingenuity in uncovering leads to find it. In the files of personal papers and vouchers of civilians,

in the correspondence of the officers and agents of the supply bureaus—especially the quartermaster and subsistence bureaus—in the reports of certain state agents, such as cotton purchasing agents and those appointed for the relief of soldiers' families, in the fragmentary records of the collectors of the tax-in-kind, there is much to be learned about conditions on the farms and plantations. Only a small part of this material was printed in the *Official Records*. The archives of the several southern state historical commissions have never been thoroughly explored; but among them are several collections of family papers as well as the correspondence of many officials who kept in close touch with the people. The most remarkable of the group last mentioned are the Zebulon Baird Vance Papers in the possession of the North Carolina Historical Commission. Governor Vance, who enjoyed the confidence of the people to a remarkable degree, received, almost daily, dozens of letters from every class and every section of North Carolina. They reflect better than any other collection with which I am acquainted conditions among the people during war-time. Other valuable collections of the correspondence of state officials, but with less of the personal element, are the papers of Governors Letcher and Smith of Virginia, in the Virginia State Library, and the papers of Governors Pettus and Clarke and of the state auditor of Mississippi in the Mississippi State Archives. It seems hardly necessary to mention the collections in the Manuscripts Division of the Library of Congress and in the McCormick Agricultural Library in Chicago. At least two southern universities, Texas and North Carolina, have made respectable beginnings in collecting manuscript materials; but an immense amount of such work is yet to be done. I believe that every investigator in the field of southern history, in whatever period, will agree that by far the greater part of the agricultural records are still in private hands and that many of them are in imminent danger of destruction.

NEWS NOTES AND COMMENTS

DECEMBER MEETING OF AGRICULTURAL HISTORY SOCIETY

The Agricultural History Society met with the American Historical Association and other historical societies at Durham and Chapel Hill, North Carolina, on December 30, 31, and January 1, as guests of Duke University and University of North Carolina. The literary program of the Agricultural History Society was on Wednesday afternoon, January 1. Professor Marcus W. Jernegan of the University of Chicago acted as chairman and the following papers were presented: Aspects of the French Contribution to American Agriculture before 1776, by Arthur H. Hirsch, visiting professor in American history at the University of Michigan; Early Use of Commercial Fertilizers in the South, by Rosser H. Taylor, professor of American history at Furman University; Efficiency and Comparative Advantage of Slave Labor and the Plantation System, by Dr. L. C. Gray, in charge of the Division of Land Economics of the U. S. Department of Agriculture. Dr. O. C. Stine, in charge of the Division of Statistical and Historical Research of the U. S. Department of Agriculture led in the discussion of papers. Materials for Southern Agricultural History was the subject for discussion at the luncheon of the Agricultural History Society on Tuesday, December 31. The Society's president, E. Merton Coulter, who is visiting professor of American history at the University of Texas, acted as chairman. Miss Kathleen Bruce of the College of William and Mary discussed Materials Relative to Virginia Agricultural History in the Ante-Bellum Period; J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton, professor of American history of the University of North Carolina, Agricultural History Materials and Their Collection; and Charles W. Ramsdell of the University of Texas, Agriculture during the Confederacy. These luncheon papers are printed elsewhere in this number of *AGRICULTURAL HISTORY*.

PERSONAL

F. E. Balmer, county agent leader in Minnesota, is chairman of a committee recently appointed in the College of Agriculture of the University of Minnesota, composed partly of college staff and extension representatives, to promote interest in the establishment of a museum of agricultural history and records for the State of Minnesota. To arouse interest in the enterprise, a limited exhibit of this sort was a feature of the Farmers' and Homemakers' Week at University Farm during the week beginning January 20, 1930.

O. C. Stine gave a talk on *Lincoln and Agriculture* at the noon-day radio network program of the Department of Agriculture on February 12. It is available as a mimeographed publication from the Division of Economic Information, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Washington, D. C.

BOOKS AND ARTICLES

An article by Walter Hough on "The Development of Agriculture" appears in the *Scientific Monthly* for October, 1929.

A brief sketch by E. A. Marples entitled "Ancient Reaping Hooks" in *Man* (London) for March, 1929, points out the similarity of the ancient Egyptian reaping hook (British Museum No. 52861) equipped with flints to form a cutting edge and the jaw-bone of an ox.

A. T. Olmstead's "Materials for an Economic History of the Ancient Near East" is included in the *Journal of Economic and Business History* for February, 1930.

Ellen Churchill Semple's "Irrigation and Reclamation in the Ancient Mediterranean Region" appears in the *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* for September, 1929.

An article by Frank O. Lowden entitled "We Can Learn a Lesson from Egypt; How the Oldest Nation in the World was Pun-

ished for Neglecting its Farmers" appears in the *Prairie Farmer* for January 18, 1930.

A study by R. S. Conway of "Horace's Farm in the Hills" is included in *Discovery* for March, 1929.

L. Franchet's "L'Agriculture en Gaul à l'Époque Romaine. Une Tremperie de Lupins à Verdes (Loire-et-Cher), Les Laveries de Blé de la Vallée du Loup (Alpes-Maritimes)" is in *Revue Scientifique Illustrée* for June 22, 1929 (67^e Année).

Mario Attilio Levi's "Intorno alla legge agraria del 111 a. C." in *Rivista Filologia-letteraria* for June, 1929, takes as its starting point the attempt made by Ch. Saumagne in *Revue de Philologie* to correct Mommsen's emendation of LL. 19-20 of C. I. L. I. 200.

Paul Couissin's "La Force Motrice Animale à Travers les Ages" in *Revue Études Anciennes* for July-September, 1928, is based largely on Lefebvre des Noëttes, *La Force Motrice à Travers les Ages*.

The *Journal of the Washington Academy of Science* includes a brief article by O. F. Cook entitled "Peru as a Primitive Center of Agriculture."

A brief article by J. M. Penard on "Land Ownership and Chieftaincy among the Chippewyan and Caribou-Eaters" is included in *Primitive Man* for January-April, 1929.

The Most Nearly Perfect Food; The Story of Milk (Baltimore, Williams & Wilkins Co., 1929), by Samuel J. Crumbine and James A. Tobey, contains a chapter entitled "Milk Through the Ages."

"Dr. Charles E. Saunders, Discoverer of Marquis wheat" is the title of a short article by Madge Thurlow Macklin in the *Johns Hopkins Alumni Magazine* for November, 1929. A portrait of Dr. Saunders is included.

Readers of *Agricultural History* will be interested in the series of valuable articles on the Ten Master Minds of Dairying which appeared in *Dairy Farmer* and *Successful Farming* during 1929. An article was devoted to each of the following: Babcock, Hoard, Eckles, DeLaval, McCullom, Pasteur, Haecker, Borden, Henry, and Hunziker. The instalments are to be published as a book by the Meredith Publishing Co., Des Moines.

"The Story of Cotton. Where the Story Begins" by Katharine Atherton Grimes in the *Southern Agriculturist* for January 1, 1930, is the first of a series of historical articles which that periodical is publishing.

Margaret A. Whiting's "Another Centenary" in the *Stone & Webster Journal* for March, 1929, is a sketch history of the Boston Horticultural Society.

"The Gulph Mill," by Charles R. Barker in the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* for April, 1929, gives the story of a famous mill in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania.

"Wheat and Corn Prices Received by Producers in Virginia, 1801-1928" by Arthur G. Peterson, economist in the Bureau of Agricultural Economics in the United States Department of Agriculture, is in the *Journal of Economic and Business History* for February, 1930.

The *North Carolina Historical Review* for October, 1929, includes an article by Frank Lawrence Owsley, professor of history in Vanderbilt University, on "The Confederacy and King Cotton: A Study in Economic Coercion."

"The Problems of South Carolina Agriculture after the Civil War" is the title of a valuable article by Francis B. Simkins in the *North Carolina Historical Review* for January, 1930.

The *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* for October, 1928, includes an article entitled "The Spanish Land Laws of Louisiana," by Francis P. Burns.

Apropos of Founders Day the *Oklahoma A. & M. College Magazine* for December, 1929, includes a number of interesting articles relating to the early history of the college. Chief among these is an article entitled "Founding the College" by B. B. Chapman, assistant professor of history. This magazine is published monthly by the Former Students Association of Oklahoma A. and M. College, the first number appearing in September, 1929.

J. Frank Dobie's *A Vaquero of the Brush Country, partly from the Reminiscences of John Young* (Dallas, Southwest Press, 1929) is a vivid picture of the cattle industry of the Texas coast region west of the Colorado River during the thirty years following the Civil War. The author has woven into the reminiscences of John Duncan Young a comprehensive study of the many phases of the cattle business of this restricted area.

Harriet Towle Atwood's "The Mormon Migration and Adaptment to Geographic Environment" in the *Vassar Journal of Undergraduate Studies* for May, 1929, contains historical material on coöperative irrigation.

The *Oregon Voter* for January 11, 1930, contains an interesting article entitled "Land Grants to States" which gives data showing Federal cessions to thirteen far-western commonwealths.

"Camels in the Inland Empire," by T. C. Elliott, and "Agriculture in the Oregon Country in 1795-1844," by J. Neilson Barry, are included in the *Oregon Historical Quarterly* for June, 1929. The latter article has a valuable list of references.

An unsigned article entitled "Agricultural and Mining Progress in Oregon; Slow but Steady Development" in the *American Trust Review of the Pacific* for May 15, 1929, is a brief historical summary apropos of the centennial of Oregon agriculture.

"The Tariff and Reconstruction" by Howard K. Beale appears in the *American Historical Review* for January, 1930.

Elizabeth Jaffary's "Farming on Peace River a Century Ago" in *Queen's Quarterly*, Summer, 1929, is based on recently found journals written by factors of the Hudson's Bay Company.

Ian D. Duff's "The Human Geography of South-western Ross-shire (1800-1929)," in the *Scottish Geographical Magazine* for September, 1929, includes an historical discussion of the stages of the shire's agricultural development.

W. Frank Perkins, *British and Irish Writers on Agriculture* (Lymington, Chas. T. King, 1929) is a bibliography of some 1,300 British and Irish writings on the agriculture of the United Kingdom, from the earliest printed books until, and including, the year 1900. Books on agricultural chemistry, botany, grasses, weeds, drainage, improvements, weights and measures, and entomology are included.

William Law Mathieson's *Great Britain and the Slave Trade, 1839-1865* (New York, 1929) is a continuation of his study, *British Slavery and its Abolition* which appeared in 1929 and is preliminary to a study of the effects of emancipation.

C. S. Orwin's *The Reclamation of Exmoor Forest* (London, Oxford University Press, H. Milford, 1929) is an historical study of the reclamation work of John and Frederick Knight at Exmoor Forest and is part of the larger subject of the spread of the inclosure movement and the allotment of the common lands.

The *Journal of the Royal Agricultural Society of England* for 1928 contains the following articles of interest: The Shire Horse, 1878-1928, by W. H. Forshaw; John Ellman of Glynde: His Life, Works, and Correspondence, by E. Walford Lloyd; The Cumberland and Westmoreland Shorthorn, by Henry G. Robinson; Bakewell's Legacy, by J. A. S. Watson; The Live Stock of Yorkshire,

by A. W. Anderson. Ellman was the man who first attempted the improvement of the Southdown sheep.

H. Blink's "De Wereldproductie van Cacao, Haar Verbreiding en Geschiedenis" in *Tijdschrift voor Economische Geographie* for December, 1928, is a summary of the world production of cocoa, its geographic distribution and history beginning with its use in Spain.

H. Blink's extensive study, "Uit de Geschiedenis der Ontginningen van den Nederlandschen Boden in den Loop der Tijden," appeared in the numbers of *Tijdschrift voor Economische Geographie* for January, February, March, and May, 1929.

Yvonne Bezard's *La Vie Rurale dans le Sud de la Région Parisienne de 1450 à 1560* has been published by Firmin-Didot, Paris.

O. Gorni's "The Problem of Rural Settlement in Spain" in the *International Labour Review* for June, 1929, is a brief account of various aspects of the agrarian history of Spain with the emphasis on recent trends.

A. Nordon's "L'Irrigation sur le Versant Lorrain des Vosges" in *Revue de Géographie Alpine* for 1928 (16:785-807) includes an historical review.

W. H. Moreland's *The Agrarian System of Moslem India* (Cambridge, W. Heffer & Sons, 1929) contains considerable information for students of British land revenue in India under Cornwallis and his successors. The author also has an article, "The Indian Peasant in History," in the *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts* for April 26, 1929.

K. Ishizaka's *Nihon Nogyo Shiron* (Historical Discussions on Japanese Agriculture. 2d ed. Tokyo, 1927) is one of the few books on the history of Japanese agriculture. In the introductory

chapter the author emphasizes the importance of the history of agriculture. In the second chapter he discusses the origin of agriculture and includes discussion of legends and mythological material. Conditions in primitive societies are dealt with in the third chapter. The remainder of the book brings the history of agriculture in Japan to the present. The book is reviewed by Hoon K. Lee, senior translator, Bureau of Agricultural Economics Library, in *Agricultural Economics Literature* for March, 1930.